

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COUNCIL
STRATEGIC PLANNING MINUTES
APRIL 6, 2006

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mary Manross, Mayor of Scottsdale, Chairperson	*Don Peyton, City of Phoenix Fire Dept. Connie Phillips, Sojourner Center
*Mark Armstrong, MC Superior Court Tony Vidale for John A. Blackburn, Jr., AZ Criminal Justice Commission	Lynn Potts for John Pombier, City of Mesa
Jerry Boone, Maricopa County Department of Public Health	Fred Scott, Councilmember of Goodyear
Dena Salter for Jennifer Casaletto, Maricopa Medical Center	*Ginger Spencer, Phoenix Family Advocacy Center
*Chris Christy, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	Frankie Grimsman for Patricia Stevens, Maricopa County Attorney's Office
*Gene D'Adamo, The Arizona Republic	Kris Scharlau for Judy Tapscott, City of Tempe
*JoAnn Del-Colle, Governor's Office Marqueta McSwain for Laura Guild, DES	Vicki Hill for Kerry G. Wangberg, City of Phoenix Prosecutor's Office
Shannon Cotton for Cindy Hallman, Marley House	Dale Weibusch, Arizona Coalition Against Domestic Violence
Scott Connelly for Dan Hughes, City of Surprise	*Rick Ybarra, Value Options
*Cmdr. Kim Humphrey, City of Phoenix, Public Affairs Bureau, Vice Chair	<u>OTHERS PRESENT:</u>
*Mary Lynn Kasunic, Area Agency on Aging	Michael Donovan, City of Surprise
Wallace Kemp, Phoenix Police Department	Janie Forino, City of Phoenix
Patricia Klahr, Chrysalis Shelter	Teresa Franquiz, MAG
*Phil Lieberman, Councilmember of Glendale	DeDe Gaisthea, MAG
Jodi Beckley Liggett, AZ Foundation for Women	Theresa James, City of Tempe
Loren Kirkeide, SRP, for JoEllen Lynn, American Express	Natalie Lewis, City of Scottsdale
Carolyn McBurney, Envision Project Management	Silvia Meyer, JFCS
Bill Hart, Office of the Attorney General	Sandy Nance, Swan Rider
*Lisa Melton, Community Legal Services	Stephanie Preciano, City of Phoenix
Michael Parascandola, City of Goodyear	Sandra Reagan, SCN
Celeste Adams for Janice Parker, Save the Family Foundation	Amy St. Peter, MAG
	Majorie Smith
	Lynn Timmons, City of Phoenix
	Martha Medina-Yoakam, My Sister's Place

+ Those attending by video/audio
conference

* Those not present or represented by
proxy

1. Call to Order

Chairperson Manross called the meeting to order at 1:10 pm. She welcomed everyone and introductions ensued.

2. Call to the Audience

No comments were made at this time.

3. Approval of the February 2, 2006 Council Meeting Minutes

Chair Manross asked if there were any revisions to the February 2, 2006 DV Council minutes. There were none. Councilmember Fred Scott, City of Goodyear, moved to approve the minutes. Tony Vidale, Arizona Criminal Justice Commission, seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

4. Update from the Governor's Commission to Prevent Violence Against Women

Chair Manross recognized that JoAnne Del-Colle from the Governor's Office, Division for Women, could not be there today and that her report would be held over until the next meeting.

5. Subcommittee Updates

Ad Hoc Membership Work Group: Chair Manross reminded the Council that this agenda was held over from the previous meeting. She introduced Dale Weibusch, Arizona Coalition Against Domestic Violence who provided the report. Mr. Weibusch noted that the Council had voted last November to form a working group that would examine the possibility of forming an ad hoc executive subcommittee. The work group met in December 2005, and he thanked those who participated. He briefly explained the recommendations formed by the work group. These recommendations included:

- ❑ An executive subcommittee (ES) would be ad hoc only, and would only meet when needed.
- ❑ The ES could provide a way to respond to time-sensitive issues, when there may not be an opportunity to convene a full meeting of the DV Council.
- ❑ The ES could also annually review operational and membership issues.
- ❑ Any recommendations made by the ES on operational or membership issues would be brought to the full Council for approval.
- ❑ If action is required by the ES on time-sensitive matters, the meeting would be open to the public and a meeting notice would be posted at least 24 hours in advance.
- ❑ Members could include the DV Council Chair, Vice-Chair, and the three subcommittee chairs from Health Cares About Family Violence, Regional Training Advisory Council, and Victim Services.
- ❑ There could also be one to two at-large members who could be elected officials or might represent private businesses.

He asked Council members if there were any questions.

Chair Manross commented that she felt forming an executive subcommittee is reasonable. She suggested that the Council might test the ad hoc group for one year. It could then be dissolved if it does not work well.

Dr. Fred Scott asked staff if the Council would need to change its charter in order to make this type of change. Teresa Franquiz, MAG, replied that official changes would not be necessary, as the proposed executive subcommittee would be ad hoc only, and meet only when needed. Its addition would not represent a permanent structural change to the Council.

Hearing no other questions or comments, Chair Manross called for a motion to approve the recommendations of the Membership Work Group to form an ad hoc executive subcommittee for the MAG Regional DV Council. Councilmember Scott moved to approve the recommendations, with a second motion from Jodi Liggett, Arizona Foundation for Women. The recommendation was unanimously approved.

Ad Hoc 41 Initiatives Work Group: Ms. Franquiz provided a summary of the draft materials from the Ad Hoc 41 Initiatives Work Group. She first clarified that the original Regional DV Plan published in 1999 contained a total of 41. A 42nd initiative was added in December 2003, and that was an initiative to increase the total number of emergency shelter beds in the MAG Region.

The work group met last month to develop some tools to assist in tracking where the Council stands on the implementation of the initiatives from the original plan. The purpose would be to allow the Council to better monitor its progress and to recognize successes, as well as areas for improvements.

The first recommendation was to simply put the relevant initiative number next to the agenda item on all DV council agendas. She referred the members to today's agenda. The second tool is the full list of initiatives showing those that are complete in italics, those in progress are in bold, and those where there has been no activity that we are aware of are in regular font. She noted that this list will be dynamic, as there is constantly going to be some activity. She added that the goal would be to capture activity in the community at large, not just those areas where there has been activity under the auspices of the DV Council. In referencing the list, she explained that most of the information on progress was taken from the Council Five Year Report Card, but the information is presented in a different way. She said that there will always be many items that fall under "some activity" because they require constant implementation and could not necessarily ever be considered "complete. For example, the first initiative to standardize and implement annual training for hospital personnel will always require ongoing implementation.

The third tool recommended by the work group is a set of bar charts that can more visually demonstrate progress made with the implementation of the initiatives. She briefly explained the two summary charts that capture progress on all of the initiatives, and the charts that show progress on the initiatives according to category.

Ms. Franquiz summarized that the three recommendations of the work group are to put the appropriate initiative number on the agendas, maintain the at-a-glance initiative list that shows where the Council stands on each individual initiative, and the bar charts that paint an overall visual picture on implementation progress. She suggested that the ad hoc executive subcommittee might annually look to update the bar charts and the initiative at-a-glance list.

Ms. Franquiz offered to take any questions. There were none at this time.

Chair Manross called for a motion to approve the draft materials from the Ad Hoc 41 Initiatives Work Group. Jerry Boone, Maricopa County Public Health Department, moved to approve the materials as presented. Bill Hart, Arizona Attorney General's Office seconded the motion. The draft materials were unanimously approved.

Health Cares About Family Violence: Dena Salter, Maricopa Medical Center. Ms. Salter apologized for Dr. Jennifer Casaletto, Health Cares About Family Violence Chair, who was not able to be there. Ms. Salter provided an update on the subcommittee's project to survey all local hospitals in Maricopa County to determine how often and how they screen their emergency patients for domestic violence. Secondly, the subcommittee developed a draft screening tool with proven reliability that will be provided to hospital emergency departments in the MAG Region, if the tool is approved by the Council today. She noted that many local hospitals use the screening question, "Do you feel safe at home?" However, many health care providers now recognize that this is not an effective question, especially if it is the only one asked. Ms. Salter noted that only Del Webb Hospital in the El Mirage/Sun City areas has not responded to the survey. She asked Council members to let her know if they are in contact with anyone affiliated with the facility who could assist in completing the survey. Dr. Fred Scott asked for Ms. Salter to email him the survey and said he would forward it on to someone who knows at Del Webb with a request for it to be completed. Ms. Salter thanked him for his assistance.

Ms. Salter reported that fifteen of the 24 hospitals that responded to the survey say they do universally screen their emergency patients. This means they screen everyone all of the time. Nine said they do not universally screen. One difficult question often asked by hospital personnel is what to do with patients who screen positive. In her experience, there are typically not enough resources available, such as brochures, safety plans, and shoe cards. This makes it difficult to determine if there is really any safety-planning going on in most hospitals, especially when they have no tools on hand to assist.

The screening tool that was recommended was the Hurt, Insulted, Threatened, Screamed At (HITS) tool. Ms. Salter stressed that the subcommittee was looking for an easy, short screening tool that would be useful in the emergency department. The full screening question is, "Have you been in a relationship in the last year where you

have been hit, insulted, threatened or screamed at?” This screening question has a proven track record and is especially useful for the emergency department.

Ms. Salter added that if the tool is approved, the subcommittee would work to distribute this screening question to hospitals in a useful format, like on a lanyard card in English and Spanish. The card would also include useful resource numbers, such as those to Child Protective Services, Adult Protective Services, and other resources as necessary. The subcommittee can also provide safety plans, shoe cards, and brochures.

Council members asked Ms. Salter to read the screening question again. She repeated, “Have you been in a relationship in the last year where you have been hurt, insulted, threatened, or screamed at?” There was a question as to whether the subcommittee would define “hurt” as physically hurt. Ms. Salter answered no, and that there should not be an attempt, at least not initially, to narrow the answer. The person conducting the screening can ask more follow up questions as necessary, if the first answer is yes. One concern was that they wanted to be careful that the question was not too long.

Dr. Scott asked if the subcommittee had been in touch with the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Health Care Organizations, which he believed was the body that initially required emergency departments to ask screening questions, like the “Do you feel safe at home?” question. Ms. Salter replied that she did not think they had been, but agreed that this is important and that she would make sure they are contacted. She added that the members of HCAFV felt the safe at home question was not appropriate because it is not specific enough. Dr. Scott recommended posting the new screening question in all of the emergency rooms.

There was another question as to why the recommended question asked “in the last year” instead of “are you currently in a relationship.” Ms. Salter replied that the subcommittee did discuss the timeframe issue at length. They had agreed not to use the word “currently” because some people are very literal in their interpretation and might answer “no,” even though the relationship just ended yesterday. The subcommittee felt defining the time period as one year was a good mid-range.

Jodi Liggett asked if it would not be useful to ask a more direct question. She asked if there had been any studies done to determine the difference in responses. Ms. Salter agreed that it was possible that some people might answer a more direct, literal question positively before this vaguer question. However, they did test a much more direct question at Maricopa Medical Center some time ago, and many patients became afraid and defensive when asked in such a direct way. It appeared that if the screener could make the question less blaming and direct, the patients tended to answer a little bit more easily. Ms. Salter informed the Council that no matter what the question, it typically takes three to five times of asking the question before a patient will ever say yes.

Dr. Scott added that the situation in the ED can be quite difficult if the perpetrator is with the patient. He suggested getting any resource information to victims without the perpetrator seeing. Ms. Salter emphatically agreed with his point and said that at Maricopa Medical Center, there is a time during every examination when staff asks to see the patient alone. Residents and nurses typically use this time to ask the question. She agreed that it is very important to teach residents to do this with their patients, and to make it seem normal. At times, Maricopa employees have given patients a blank card with nothing on it except the phone number to reach the DV advocates at the hospital. All advocates are trained to answer the phone in a way that will not betray what service they provide.

Hearing no other comments or questions regarding the screening tool, Chair Manross called for a motion to approve the draft screening question, as recommended by the Health Cares About Family Violence Subcommittee. Connie Phillips, Sojourner Center, moved to approve the screening question, and Carolyn Mc Burney, Envision Management, seconded the motion. The recommended screening tool was unanimously approved.

Victim Services Subcommittee: Connie Phillips, Sojourner Center, provided an update from the Victim Services Subcommittee. The subcommittee is currently working on an economic case statement to determine the financial impact of domestic violence on municipalities' criminal justice systems. A survey has been developed in conjunction with the ASU Partnership for Community Development's Dr. Burk. This survey will be sent to a small group of pilot cities and towns. Once the initial results are analyzed, revisions will be made to the survey instrument. At this point, all cities and towns in Maricopa County will receive the survey. Amy St. Peter, MAG, noted that there is a great deal of information the subcommittee and Council members would like to have, but it was necessary to narrow the focus of the survey and project in order to keep the focus sharp and the quality of information good. Chair Manross asked the Council for any questions or comments on the draft economic case statement survey.

Mr. Weibusch noted that "ex parte" is two words, not one. Frankie Grimsman, Maricopa County Prosecutor's Office, asked if the projected was to be focused only on cities and towns. Ms. St. Peter said yes, the focus would be on municipalities.

Hearing no other comments or questions, Chair Manross called for a motion to approve the draft economic case statement survey. Dale Wiesbuch moved to approve the survey. Councilmember Scott seconded the motion. The economic case statement survey was unanimously approved.

Human Services Coordinating Committee Youth Policy Subcommittee: Amy St. Peter, MAG, provided the update on the joint project of the DV Council and the HSCC Youth Policy Subcommittee. Working on the joint project has been exciting in that it has brought together members of two different groups at MAG that normally do not work together. The purpose of their project is to look at the impact of DV on

youth. During the focus groups conducted last summer in gathering data for the 2006 Regional Human Services Plan, it was found that youth often do not feel safe in their neighborhoods, schools, or often in their homes. However, the youth who participated in the focus groups expressed the desire to be involved in working on a solution to that problem.

Part of the project will be about raising awareness, and the group was initially working on a resource list of services for youth who have experienced domestic or teen dating violence, but the list is on hold for now. The group decided that they first wanted to find out from teens what information they feel they need and what format they would use. In order to collect this information, the group and staff will be doing more focus groups with youth to ask them these questions. Ms. St. Peter said that six focus groups have been scheduled and the range of participants is good. There will be some conducted in more affluent communities, some with youth in foster care, and some with mainstream middle class youth. These focus group sessions are scheduled throughout April because schools will be letting out for summer very shortly.

Ms. St. Peter referred the Council to the list of focus group questions that was drafted by the HSCC Youth Policy Subcommittee, as well as the draft written survey. She stressed the desire to talk about domestic violence and teen dating violence accurately and in a way that teens will respond. She asked for any comments or questions from the Council.

Chair Manross commented that they are good questions and she is eager to see the responses. Mr. Weibusch noted that both teen dating violence and DV are discussed on the first page, but later in the survey, only DV is noted. He cautioned that teens often think DV is only an adult problem, and that it does not apply to them. Chair Manross followed up on this concern by asking Ms. St. Peter to clarify the goal, and whether the intent was to get information from the youth on both teen dating violence and domestic violence. She also commented that it might be helpful to try to understand what their definition is when they think about violence. She suggested possibly adding a question at the beginning to see how they define it.

Loren Kirkeide, SRP, asked if asking the questions too specifically would make the scope of the answers too narrow. He suggested using the term “family violence” in lieu of domestic violence, but also to include dating violence. Frankie said important to separate them out so they are two different questions. Ms. Liggett agreed and said that DV is an abstract concept to most teenagers. She suggested that they might better understand family violence.

Dr. Scott asked if schools still have newspapers, and whether they might be a good vehicle for disseminating the survey. Ms. Grimsman confirmed that several now have online newsletters. Patricia Klahr, Chrysalis, asked what age range the focus groups would be conducted with. Ms. St. Peter replied that participants would be teenagers, mostly between the ages of 15-18. Ms. Klahr stressed the need to use the correct language for them, and not to speak above or below them if possible.

Chair Manross noted that however we articulate the questions, it will have been a useful exercise if the teens come to understand that DV is what we are talking about. She added that part of the reason for doing the survey is to create awareness about domestic violence among teens and about its pervasiveness. She suggested putting the most abstract or technical term of “domestic violence” in parenthesis after family violence so they can be educated about what the term DV really means.

Kris Scharlau, Tempe Care 7, commented that she has teenagers at home and they do not really understand what teen dating violence is. She asked whether we could define this for them in the course of the focus groups. She added that their lack of understanding could really be exacerbated if they grew up with family violence in the home. In those cases, they may not recognize dating violence as anything out of the ordinary. It was noted that the paragraph at the top of the second page will be included to clarify this issue for survey takers.

Ms. Klahr expressed concern about the Coalition being listed as the only contact, as it is not available 24 hours. She told that Council that Chrysalis currently has public service announcements running on VH1 and they have had the most response from teenagers when they run in the middle of the night. She suggested also adding the National Domestic Violence hotline or the local Teen Life Line.

Mr. Kirkeide noted that language can be intimidating, and suggested including examples wherever possible. Ms. Liggett suggested adding a threshold question like, “What is your source of information normally?” This would allow us to capture nontraditional sources of information also. When they want to know something, where do they turn first?

Ms. St. Peter thanked the Council for their input. The HSCC Youth Policy Subcommittee will be going ahead with the focus groups and the written survey over the next month, and she will provide another update to the Council at their next meeting in June.

6. 2007 Human Services Event Work Group Volunteers

Chair Manross asked Ms. St. Peter to provide the Council with information on the human services event planned for next year. Ms. St. Peter began by informing the Council that staff is in the early stages of planning an event for early next year to do strategic planning for regional human services. Historically, the Human Services Technical and Coordinating Committees met annually to do the strategic planning for all of the MAG human services committees. However, staff feels that we needed to include the other two major human services committees that are relatively newer at MAG; namely, this DV Council and the Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness. There are four vibrant groups working on human services issues at MAG, and they all need to be included in the planning effort in order to achieve the most coordinated result. An example of where more coordinated planning is already working is in the joint project between the DV Council and the HSCC Youth Policy

Subcommittee. Another purpose for the event is to continue to engage the approximately 250 community members who participated in the focus groups and community hearings last summer. A great dialog was started in collecting information for the Regional Human Services Plan, and we want to continue that dialog.

Ms. St. Peter went on to clarify that it would likely be a half-day event. The outcome would be a coordinated strategic plan for all of the human services committees for the following year. With more people participating in the initial planning process, it would hopefully build up more energy around any new initiatives.

Ms. St. Peter said that staff is forming a work group to plan the event. They need volunteers from each subcommittee to participate in the work in order to ensure a balanced plan for the event. She said that staff is looking for at least one volunteer from this group today. She assured members that the work group will meet efficiently and will be respectful of the members' time. At this point, the group would like only need to meet every other month, but possibly more frequently as the event draws nearer.

Mr. Hart asked Ms. St. Peter expand a little more on her explanation of the day. She clarify that all members of the four major human services committees at MAG would be invited to attend, as well as those community members that participated in the focus groups and community hearings last summer. There would possibly be a presentation from each of the committees on the progress they have made on the initiatives contained in the Regional Human Services Plan. There would also be breakout groups at some point in the day, with the topics for each to be determined by the planning work group. She clarified that the event would be for strategic planning purposes. At the end of the day, the goal would be to clearly identify three to five projects the human services committees could work on collectively to the benefit of the region.

Ms. Liggett asked what the timeframe would be for the event. Ms. St. Peter replied that it would likely be held in February 2007. Planning would begin in earnest this June. The planning work group would likely meet once or twice over the summer to confirm larger details like the date and venue. They will do as many things over the phone and via email as possible. Bill Hart, Jodi Liggett, and Frankie Grimsman volunteered to participate in the planning work group. Ms. St. Peter thanked them for their participation and said she would be contacting them soon.

7. Maryvale Partners in Action (Initiative # 39)

Chair Manross introduced Jane Forino, Director of the John F. Long Family Services Center. Ms. Forino provided a presentation on the neighborhood group Maryvale Partners in Action.

Ms. Forino thanked Ms. Franquiz for inviting her to the meeting and thanked the Council for having her. She began by explaining how the Maryvale Partners in Action group was started. It came about as part of the City of Phoenix Human Services

Department strategic plan. The department has many programs, one of which is the family service center model. Each center was asked to survey its community to come up with an initiative that would address the specific needs in their communities. At John F. Long they held several public forums at local schools, faith-based organizations, hospitals, and neighborhood block watch meetings. A recurring theme that kept coming up was DV. They then began looking at existing services in Maryvale to identify any gaps. The Center identified DV as its initiative in July of 2005. A group of Maryvale residents and stakeholders was convened and their meetings are held every month on the fourth Monday. They have had panel discussions with DV experts like police, judges, health care professionals and others to get more information to community members about what is going on in Maryvale around the issue of DV.

This group, Maryvale Partners in Action, decided to focus on three areas and has formed three subcommittees. The first subcommittee is focused on awareness and education. Their efforts have been very comprehensive. This subcommittee has partnered with the Golden Gate Community Center, which recently received a grant from St. Luke's Health Initiative. The group is currently doing surveys at community health fairs to determine how prevalent DV is in the community and they are getting very high positive responses. They also plan to do a train the trainer with provider agencies and faith-based organizations. They have partnered with the Maricopa County Public Health Department to deliver the training. The purpose would be to raise awareness of DV, assist providers in identifying it, and helping them to know what to do from there. The Center is able to offer social workers at each of the subcommittee's events to be available to anyone who comes forward and might need assistance. There is a special effort at these events to educate undocumented women about the Violence Against Women Act and about what services they are eligible to receive. There is also a component of education for abusers. They are using the City of Phoenix Public Information Office to get the word out about the events.

The second subcommittee is focused on forming more support groups in the Maryvale area. Ms. Forino was proud to share that they have been able to start the first Spanish speaking support group in Maryvale, with the partnership of the New Life Center, which has offered to provide bilingual facilitators. They also have begun a late-life 50-plus support group with the assistance of the Area Agency on Aging Doves Program. The space for the support groups is available at the Center. Now they just need to do the marketing for the groups. Ms. Forino noted how ideal it is have the groups meet at the Center, where there are people available to address any longer-term needs participants may have.

The third subcommittee is working to recruit more volunteer advocates to ride along with the Maryvale police and to be stationed at Maryvale Hospital. The Phoenix Police Department applied for a grant that would allow them to hire staff to work with and recruit volunteers. They will hear next week whether they received the grant.

Chair Manross asked how big the Maryvale area is. Ms. Forino said there are no clear boundaries, as it is still part of the City of Phoenix. However, it can loosely be defined as the area between 23rd Avenue and 75th Avenue, and from McDowell to Camelback. Chair Manross commented how big the area is. Ms. Phillips commented that it is very exciting to hear about this group, and reminded the Council that they have talked about issue of involving neighborhood groups a lot over the years. She hoped this group will become a model that can expand, possibly through other service centers. She asked Ms. Forino how it was originally initiated. Ms. Forino said it came about mainly through herself and her advisory board. She added that the goal is that the Center can eventually back out and allow the community to own it. There are four centers in the City of Phoenix and their directors are rotated every four years. She said that she will definitely be taking this model with her when she moves to her next post.

Ms. Franquiz thanked Ms. Forino for coming and sharing the information about Maryvale Partners in Action. She commented that she has been going to their meeting for about five to six months and is always impressed at the size and variety of the turnout. The interest and energy has been consist and she has been very impressed.

8. Legislative Updates

Chair Manross asked Mr. Weibusch to provide the Council with a brief legislative update of items currently before the state legislature pertaining to DV.

Mr. Weibusch began with bills that are not likely to move forward. SB 1097, the order of protection bill, has been very significantly revised and is now the human egg donor bill. SB 1416 would have allowed DV and sexual assault victims to be released from rental leases without penalty. However, the Multi-Housing Association secured agreement from the sponsoring legislator to take the DV victim clause out of the bill. Chairman Farnsworth of Senate Judiciary Committee ultimately decided not to hear the bill at all.

HB 2716 was a bill that would have changed how complaints to licensing boards are handled. It would have applied mainly to custody evaluators and parenting coordinators. If a complaint were to be found without merit, the complainant would have been required to pay costs and attorneys' fees. This would have been a burden on victims. The more positive side would have been that abusers who filed complaints just to get rid of an evaluator would have been discouraged from filing frivolous or malevolent complaints as well.

Mr. Weibusch then covered the bills that are still under consideration. SB 1147 pertains to anyone interfering with an emergency phone call to 911. If a victim attempts to call 911 and is interrupted by someone, that person would be guilty of a class two misdemeanor. The bill has already cleared the House Judiciary Committee and it is likely to go through.

HB 2124 provides eviction protection to victims of crime. Currently, if someone calls 911 or the police on a victim's behalf in an apartment situation, landlords consider it a violation of the crime-free/drug-free lease addendum, as they are summoning assistance. This bill would no longer consider this action a violation of the victim's lease agreement.

SB 1145, called the "castle doctrine" bill, is based on the premise that a man's home is his castle, and one has the right to protect himself and his family. This premise is already in statute. Some legislators wanted to expand the premise to include carjackings. It has become a huge new bill that would shift the burden of proof to self-defense. In a DV scenario, if an abuser shoots and kills their partner, the perpetrator could say that he/she was acting in self-defense. The burden would be on the State to prove otherwise. There was caucus discussion on the bill today. It is very controversial. The Chiefs of Police are against the bill, and an amendment will likely be offered on the floor of the House to shift the burden of proof back. The Coalition's stance is that they are supporting the amendment, but not the bill itself.

Mr. Hart asked if there has been any word on the budget. Mr. Weibusch said that no one knows yet. Members have been invited into leadership meetings to give their input as to what they would like to see in the budget. The Coalition has found a real champion in Senator Waring who supports the budget proposal from the Governor to provide additional funding for more DV shelter beds. However, there has not been a lot of movement that anyone can see. The Appropriations Committee has not met in two weeks, and the Chair says they will not meet again until they have a budget. The \$1 million for shelter beds was approved on the Senate side, but that was a long time ago. Mr. Hart asked when he thought the budget negotiations might be completed. Mr. Weibusch was not sure, but noted that generally a good marker is the 100 day mark, because that is when per diem gets cut to \$20 per day.

9. Announcements

Loren Kirkeide, SRP and representative of Employers Against Domestic Violence, made an announcement about the Walk to End DV. He added that the Council is already aware of EADV moving over to the Arizona Foundation for Women. They had their first strategic planning at SRP recently and he asked to be on next Council agenda to share more information on that.

He stressed that EADV wants to continue to grow the Walk again this year. The goal is to get 5,000 walkers this year and to distribute \$300,000 to the local shelters. He encouraged everyone to start their teams if they have not already. Laura Lange is the Walk Manager. She can be emailed for more information at llange@azfoundationforwomen.org. He recommended the "Team Up to Fight Domestic Violence" handout, which contains tips on getting people involved and building teams. It is a great event and he asked everyone to be there. If you cannot come, he asked that you please do what you can to get donations.

Ms. Liggett added that the AZ Foundation for Women is now the organizing agency for the Walk. She brought lots of brochures and also recommended the website as a good source of information. The Governor will be the Honorary Chair again this year and Senator Waring is also forming a huge team. Historically, many last minute registrations come in the last couple weeks before the Walk. So far, 1500 have signed up. Frankie Grimsman added that her office already has a team, and they found it very easy to sign up online. Chair Manross encouraged everyone to come and form teams.

Connie Phillips announced that Sojourner Center will soon be having their first grand opening for their new transitional living program. With assistance from the City of Phoenix, AZ Department of Housing, Community Development Block Grant funds, and private donations, their capital campaign has been able to raise funds for nine new beds. They will soon be opening more, but nine will be completed and operational first. The grand opening will be on May 11.

10. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m. Chair Manross thanked everyone for their participation. The next Regional DV Council meeting will be on Thursday, June 1 from 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. at the MAG offices, second floor, Saguaro Room.